



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,454	07/30/2003	Paul J. Holmquist	279.B25US1	9029
21186 7590 04/09/2008 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER FLORY, CHRISTOPHER A	
			ART UNIT 3762	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/630,454	Applicant(s) HOLMQUIST ET AL.	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER A. FLORY	Art Unit 3762	

All Participants:

(1) CHRISTOPHER A. FLORY.

(2) Paul Urbanski.

Date of Interview: 7 April 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: 71

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 10:45 am

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Lebel (2002/0049480) in view of Webb et al. (6,699,187).

Claims discussed:

1 and 37

Prior art documents discussed:

Brashears (6,985,762); Labounty (6,871,211)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner would like to thank Mr. Urrbanski for his time and constructive discussion of the proposed amendments to claims 1 and 37 faxed on 8 January 2008. It was agreed upon that the proposed amendment to claim 1 would be sufficient to overcome the rejections as made in the most recent Office Action. Regarding the amendment to claim 37, the Examiner brought to the attention of the Applicant prior art references Brashears 6,985,762 (column 9, line 31 through column 10, line 4) and Labounty 6,871,211 (column 2, line 50 through column 3, line 11) which would read on the claim. Specifically, Brashears discloses two separate subnetworks that use two separate data languages/algorithms, and a repeater in the system to translate from one language to the other before transmitting over the separate subnetworks.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/George Manuel/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

